

PRESS RELEASE

First DSA Transparency Report: 84% of reviewed platform content moderation decisions overturned — significant differences between platforms in implementation

User Rights presents data from 8,749 proceedings. Error rates are high across all platforms. Whether corrections are made, however, varies considerably.

Berlin, 23 March 2026 — In 84% of completed proceedings, the original platform decision was overturned. This is the central finding of the first Transparency Report by User Rights, the first certified out-of-court dispute settlement body in Germany under the Digital Services Act (DSA). The report analyses 8,749 submissions from all EU Member States — covering TikTok, Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Pinterest.

The data reveal a high rate of erroneous moderation decisions across platforms. At the same time, they document significant differences in whether and how platforms respond to those errors.

Key Findings

- **84% of proceedings were decided in favour of complainants:**
In approximately 3,060 of 3,630 completed proceedings, the original platform decision was unfounded — either because the platform corrected its error following the initiation of proceedings or because User Rights determined the decision to be false. In complaint cases — meaning cases in which users contest restrictions taken against them — this figure is as high as 94%. Where all information was available and a full legal review was conducted, 80% of moderation measures proved unjustified.
- **Effective resolution rate: between 4% and 69%:**
Whether complainants actually obtained their desired outcome — such as the reinstatement of a suspended account or the removal of reported content — depends substantially on the platform. At TikTok, complainants achieved their desired outcome in 69% of cases. At Meta's platforms Instagram and Facebook, the rate stands at under 7% and 4%, respectively.
- **65% successful dispute settlement:**
In just under two thirds of all proceedings, the final treatment of the content corresponds to the outcome of the dispute settlement process. The rate ranges from almost 90% at TikTok to under 13% at Meta.

Divergent Response Patterns

The Transparency Report documents significant differences in how platforms engage with independent review.

TikTok corrects its own decision through an Immediate Remedy in over half of all cases, before User Rights has conducted any substantive legal review. The Implementation Rate — covering cases in which User Rights conducted a legal review and called on the platform to correct its decision — stands at 35.7%, well above the cross-platform average of 13.0%.

The **Meta platforms** Instagram and Facebook show a different pattern. The Immediate Remedy rate is below 2%. In more than half of the concluded cases, Meta either raised admissibility objections that User Rights considered unjustified or failed to respond. The Implementation Rate in cases where User Rights found the platform decision to be unjustified stands at 3.8%.

User Rights does not attribute these differences to varying error rates in internal moderation systems, but rather to divergent patterns of engagement with external review.

“Whether users obtain effective redress depends, according to the data, not solely on whether the platform decision was unjustified. What is decisive is how the platform concerned responds to a finding of error.” — Raphael Kneer, Co-Founder and Managing Director of User Rights

Growing Demand

Case volume nearly quadrupled over the course of the year — from 392 submissions in January to 1,491 in December 2025. A notable shift is also observed in the type of proceedings: the share of cases in which a platform failed to remove content reported by a user rose from 20% in the first half of the year to 54% in the fourth quarter. In the first half of the year, proceedings were predominantly initiated by complainants challenging measures taken against themselves (e.g., account suspensions).

Context and Regulation

The systematic differences in Implementation Rates raise the question of how effective out-of-court dispute settlement under Article 21 DSA is in practice. The DSA requires platforms to engage with these proceedings “in good faith” (Article 21(2) DSA). Whether the documented Implementation Rates meet this standard is a matter for assessment by the competent supervisory authorities.

User Rights has submitted the Transparency Report to the Bundesnetzagentur as Germany’s Digital Services Coordinator, to the Irish Coimisiún na Meán, and to the European Commission.

“The European legislator introduced dispute settlement as a mechanism to effectively protect rights on social media. The figures from the first year show that this can succeed — when platforms engage in the proceedings.

The future of this new mechanism depends on whether supervisory authorities ensure that all platforms cooperate effectively.” — Dr Niklas Eder, Co-Founder and Managing Director of User Rights

About User Rights

User Rights is the first certified out-of-court dispute settlement body in Germany under Article 21 DSA. In 2025, User Rights opened more than 4,400 proceedings across five platforms in German, English, French, and Italian for complainants from all 27 EU Member States.

Transparency Report: <https://www.user-rights.org/en/transparency-report>

Website: www.user-rights.org

Press contact: Raphael Kneer · presse@user-rights.org · +49 30 2332 32040

For editorial teams: Graphics, data sheets, and background information available on request.